



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1500  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/700,378

11/03/2003

Sampo J. Kaasila

BIT01-K-US

5987

42306

7590

02/01/2007

EDWARD W. PORTER  
PORTER & ASSOCIATES  
24 STRING BRIDGE S12  
EXETER, NH 03833

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LACT

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/01/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/700,378

Applicant(s)

KAASILA ET AL.

Examiner

Cong-Lac Huynh

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 21-28 and 32 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-20, 29-31, 33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 7/6/06 to the application filed on 11/3/03, priority 6/5/01.
2. Claims 1-33 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, 11, 17, 21, 32-33 are independent claims.
3. The double patenting rejection on claims 1-2 over claim 1 of copending application 10/138,923 has been withdrawn in view of the submission of the terminal disclaimer on 8/28/06.
4. The 112, second paragraph rejections of claims 15 and 31 have been withdrawn in view of the amendment.

### ***Claim Objections***

5. Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: the word "download" (line 8) within "...in said digital content are download" is not proper. It should be "downloaded."

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2178

7. Claims 17-19, 29, 33 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rohrabough et al. (US Pat App Pub No. 2005/0132286, 6/16/05, priority 6/12/00).

Regarding independent claim 17, Rohrabough discloses:

- accessing the web page including one or more images and one or more text strings (figures 7A-B, 8A-B, [0051])
- displaying in a landscape orientation, in a scaled-down manner, a portion of said web page, including at least some of images and text strings (figures 7A-B, 8A-B, [0058], [0064])
- performing said displaying on a screen of a computer having an operating system that displays an associated graphical user interface on said screen in a portrait orientation (figures 7A-B, 8A-B, [0102])
- wherein the scaled-down displaying of said web page includes:
  - o displaying a given image at a scaled-down pixel size (figures 7A-B, 8A-B, [0088], [0094])
  - o displaying a given text string with a string image composed on said computer from a plurality of font bitmaps corresponding to the characters of said string when displayed in said landscape orientation ([0098]-[0102])
  - o the shape and pixel alignment of a given character represented in said display by one of said font bitmaps have been selected as a function of a

given size of said bitmap to improve the readability of said bitmap at said  
given bitmap size ([0079], [0080],[0096]-[0098])

Regarding claims 18-19, which are dependent on claim 17, Rohrabach discloses that the operating system can only display said graphical interface on said screen in said portrait orientation or in either said portrait or said landscape orientation [0102]).

Regarding claim 29, which is dependent on claim 17, Rohrabach discloses that said computer is a handheld device (figures 7A-B, 8A-B).

Regarding claim 30, which is dependent on claim 17, Rohrabach discloses:

- the computer on which said scaled-down display is shown requests a web page from a remote computer over a computer network (figures 2A-C, 3)
- said remote computer accesses said web page
- said remote computer lays said web page out to determine relative position corresponding to the relative positions at which said images, strings, and links are to be displayed (figures 2A-C, 7A-C)
- said remote computer downloads said images, strings, links, and relative positions over said computer network to said display computer (figures 2A-C, 7A-C)

- said display computer draws said images, strings, and links at relative positions on said screen determined as a function of said downloaded relative positions (figures 2A-C, [0078]-[0080])

Regarding claim 31, which is dependent on claim 30, Rohrbaugh discloses that said remote computer:

- scales down each of said displayed images to said scaled-down pixel size and downloads said scaled-down image to the display computer ([0078], [0095]-[0098])
- performs said layout based on a font metrics determined for each strings as a function of the size of the individual font bitmaps the will be used to compose the string image said display computer ([0098], [0094]-[0095])

Claim 33 is a system of method claim 17, and is rejected under the same rationale.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2178

9. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rohrabough as applied to claim 17 above and further in view of Mott et al. (US Pat No. 6,326,970, 12/4/01, filed 10/2/98).

Regarding claim 20, which is dependent on claim 17, Rohrabough does not disclose:

- allowing a user to select to have said scaled-down display of a given layout performed at different scale factors
- the scaled-down pixel size at which each image is shown in displays performed at different scale factor varies as a function of said different scale factors
- the sizes of the font bitmaps shown in said string images in displays performed at different scale factors varies as a function of said different scale factors
- the shape and pixel alignment of corresponding characters in the font bitmaps of such different font sizes are different to improve readability of font bitmaps at each of such different font sizes

Mott discloses:

- allowing a user to select to have said scaled-down display of a given layout performed at different scale factors (col 5, line 10 to col 6, line 65)
- the scaled-down pixel size at which each image is shown in displays performed at different scale factor varies as a function of said different scale factors (col 6, line 51 to col 7, line 9)

- the sizes of the font bitmaps shown in said string images in displays performed at different scale factors varies as a function of said different scale factors (figure 1B, col 1, line 60 to col 2, line 18)
- the shape and pixel alignment of corresponding characters in the font bitmaps of such different font sizes are different to improve readability of font bitmaps at each of such different font sizes (col 6, line 66 to col 7, line 20)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Mott into Rohrbaugh since Mott discloses more details on how to scale down images and text according to a scale factor providing the advantage to incorporate into the feature of scaling images and text in Rohrbaugh for specifically scaling text and images to a certain size according to the scale factor to produce images and text suitable to a certain display screen.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

10. Claims 1- 16, 21-28, 32 are allowed.

***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments filed 7/6/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding independent claim 17, Applicants argue that Rohrbaugh fails to disclose displaying in a landscape orientation a portion of a web page in a scaled-down manner



wherein said displaying is performed on an associated graphical user interface on a portrait orientation.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Rohrbaugh provides scaling images and text for the landscape orientation and the portrait orientation with a ratio ([0102]). This implies providing the two possibilities of obtaining scaled images and text in the landscape orientation and the portrait orientation. Since it is well known to switch a display from a landscape orientation to a portrait orientation and vice versa, Rohrbaugh suggests displaying in a landscape orientation a portion of a web page in a scaled down manner when said displaying is performed on an associated graphical user interface on a portrait orientation based on the scaled images and text obtained in the two orientations with a ratio.

### ***Conclusion***

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

White et al. (US 6,133,913). Shetter et al. (US 6,342,890).

Andrew et al. (US 6,392,673). Stoub (US 2001/0011364).

Amano (US 2002/0063697). Kaasila (US 2004/0183817). Willis et al. (US 5,568,571).

Bjork et al., West : A Web Browser for Small Terminals, ACM 1999, pages 187-196.

Buyukkokten et al., Seeing the Whole in Parts : Text Summarization for Web Browsing on Handheld Devices, ACM 2001, pages 652-662.

Art Unit: 2178

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cong-Lac Huynh  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2178  
1/29/07